



Nez Perce - Clearwater National Forests Plan Revision Consideration of Benefits and Contributions from Multiple Uses and Ecosystem Services Briefing Paper

Date: May 19th 2015

Topic: Considerations of Multiple Uses and Ecosystem Services Benefits and Contributions in NPCW's Forest Plan Revision Alternatives Development

Background: The planning team is now in the process of reviewing public comments and documenting potential issues. The team will use these issues to develop alternatives to the proposed action. These alternatives, and further refinement of the proposed action, will appear in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). As part of this process, the team is making the endeavor to consider the full range of benefits and contributions the public receive from the forest.

The 2012 planning rule directs that forest *'plans will guide management of NFS lands so that they... have the capacity to provide people and communities with ecosystem services and multiple uses that provide a range of social, economic, and ecological benefits for the present and into the future'* (36 CFR 219.1). One way to accomplish this in an integrative manner is by bringing into play a concept that would naturally serves as the connective tissues between the three sciences: ecological, social and economic.

Key Points:

- 1) Ecosystem services are benefits people received from the environments; it is a framework that bridges ecology, economics and social science.
- 2) Beneficiaries are groups or users who experience the benefits deriving from multiple uses and ecosystems services
- 3) As we review the proposed action, explicit understanding is made on how plan components will contribute to different beneficiaries.
 - a) This step is not a novel one – this is similar to subsequent social effects analysis in any environmental document.
 - b) However, we are making the conscious effort to bear in mind of beneficiaries upfront in order to better inform the alternative development process.
- 4) As we examine the connections between plan components and benefits / contributions from multiple uses and ecosystem services, we ask ourselves the following:
 - a) Under different alternatives, how well do plan components contribute to, or create opportunities for the public / beneficiaries?
 - b) What are some of the components, if any, that would potentially affect beneficiaries in a negative way?
 - c) Are we over-emphasizing or overlooking any particular group(s) of benefits?
- 5) Trade-off is inherent in any managed system; the ecosystem services concept can better inform the team, to be more cognizant of potential trade-offs or conflicting uses.

What this process is NOT:

- A way to let social sciences drive forest planning decision
- A way to put emphasis on ecosystem benefits, over traditional uses such as commodity extraction
- A completely novel concept

In summary, this process will:

- Highlight the trade-offs among conflicting uses and services.
- Better inform the alternatives development process, by placing a conscious efforts into the consideration of the full range of benefits and contributions the public receive from FS land management plan
- Consider the full range of benefits and contributions people receive from multiple uses and ecosystem services, including aesthetic values, air quality, water quality, cultural / heritage resources, hunting, fishing, recreational experiences including motorized and non-motorized opportunities, provisioning services such as timber / fiber, mineral resources and forage for grazing, passive values for the environment, solitudes, as well as other ecological services.

Next Steps: Continue to develop a range of alternatives for DEIS

Contact: Zach Peterson, Forest Planner (208)-935-4239
Kawa Ng, Economist (303)-275-5152
Keith Stockman, Economist (406)-329-3549